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Date: February 25, 2015

Lead Agency (FHWA or State DOT): Michigan DOT

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

*Project Managers and/or research project investigators should complete a quarterly progress report for each calendar quarter during which the projects are active. Please provide a project schedule status of the research activities tied to each task that is defined in the proposal; a percentage completion of each task; a concise discussion (2 or 3 sentences) of the current status, including accomplishments and problems encountered, if any. List all tasks, even if no work was done during this period.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Transportation Pooled Fund Program Project #****TPF-5(254)** | **Transportation Pooled Fund Program - Report Period:**□Quarter 1 (January 1 – March 31)□Quarter 2 (April 1 – June 30)□Quarter 3 (July 1 – September 30)□Quarter 4 (October 1 – December 31) |
| **Project Title:****Evaluation and Analysis of Decked Bulb-T Beam Bridge (As Alternate ABC to Side-by-Side Box Beam)** |
| **Name of Project Manager(s):**Matt Chynoweth, P.E.- MDOT PMDave Juntunen, P.E.- Co. PM | **Phone Number:**517-322-3322517-335-2993 | **E-Mail**ChynowethM@michigan.govjuntunend@michigan.gov   |
| **Lead Agency Project ID:**MDOT Job No. 114419MDOT Research No. OR11-010 | **Other Project ID (i.e., contract #):**Contract No. 2010-0293 | **Project Start Date:**September 19, 2011 |
| **Original Project End Date:**September 30, 2014 | **Current Project End Date:**April 30, 2015 | **Number of Extensions:**2 (2nd Ext. Pending) |

Project schedule status:

□On schedule (NCTE) □On revised schedule □Ahead of schedule □Behind schedule

Overall Project Statistics:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Total Project Budget** |  **Total Cost to Date for Project** |  **Percentage of Work**  **Completed to Date** |
| TOTAL REVISED BUDGET: $ 367,200.00Research Revised Budget: $ 361,448.61Travel Revised Budget: $ 5,751.39 Pending Amendment No. 3 | Total Costs: $ 358,973.78Research Cost: $ 353,222.39Travel Costs: $ 5,751.39 | Work: 98 % |

***Quarterly*** Project Statistics:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Total Project Expenses**  **and Percentage This Quarter** |  **Total Amount of Funds**  **Expended This Quarter** |  **Total Percentage of**  **Time Used to Date** |
| $358,973.78 (98 %) | $10,386.37 | Time: 97 % |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description**:To analyze and evaluate the decked bulb-T beam (or decked I- beam) as a viable replacement for the side-by-side box-beam bridge. The project description uses the term bulb- T beam as a general description of an I- beam shape, with a wide top flange that canserve as a deck surface. For this type of beam to be a viable replacement to a box beam, it must have a very robust cross-section designed to have a shallow depth-to-span ratio; which makes it very different than the standard AASHTO section used by some states.The use of a bulb- T beam cross section would eliminate inherent problems associated with the ability to inspect and repair box-beam type structures. The Bulb-T beam cross-section will provide enough space at the section bottom for ease of periodical inspections andmaintenance of critical elements; such as beam web and the suffit of the bridge deck slab.**Scope of Work:**The purpose of this proposed study is to collaborate and share common interests with State DOTs in the Midwest area, and other research stakeholders, regarding alternative/innovative solution(s)to environmental and structural challenges in building and maintaining a sustainable transportation infrastructure. In correlation with analyzing the bulb T beam this study includes comparing alternative non corrosive materials, including, but not limited to carbon fiber, stainless steel and stainless clad reinforcement materials. The study analysis and evaluation will include the evaluation of top flange connection details including the use of ultra high performance concrete (UHPC) to fill the joint between the adjacent decked bulb t beams (as used in New York). The goal is to have a bridge structure with a service life exceeding 100 years, and have rapid construction applicability.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Progress this Quarter (includes meetings, work plan status, contract status, significant progress, etc.):**Task 1 is 100% completed.Task 2 is approximately 100% completed.Task 3 is approximately 100% completed.Percent of Completion: Experimental Investigation (EI) Portion 100% complete.Numerical Simulation (NS) Portion 100% complete.Work In Progress: The Principal Investigator performed a more thorough review of the Finite Element Analysis, results of the parametric study, and the experimental investigation work results. Also, the draft final report was updated to incorporate TAC member’s feedback and comments. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Results This Period:****Completing the project’s Final Report.** |
| **Circumstance(s) affecting project or budget. (Please describe any challenges encountered or anticipated that might****affect the completion of the project within the time, scope, and fiscal constraints as set forth in the agreement.****Include any recommended solutions to those problems). The TAC members approved a project time extension to allow the Principal Investigator to complete an exhaustive review of the research analysis, experiments, and findings.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Potential Implementation:**  |